

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,295	06/29/2001	William J. Boyle	ACS-56001 (26361)	1994
24201 7	590 02/24/2005		EXAMINER	
FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP			RAGONESE, ANDREA M	
HOWARD HU 6060 CENTER	IGHES CENTER DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TENTH FLOC	OR .		3743	·
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		09/897,295	BOYLE ET AL.					
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Andrea M. Ragonese	1					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	opears on the cover she	eet with the correspondence a	ddress				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion reto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturely received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, reply within the statutory minimum d will apply and will expire SIX (6 tte, cause the application to become	may a reply be timely filed of thirty (30) days will be considered time by MONTHS from the mailing date of this come ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02</u>	<u>December 2004</u> .						
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims		·					
4)🖂	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3-32 and 41-51</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-19 and 27-32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>3-13,20-26 and 41-51</u> is/are rejected	d.						
· —	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requiremen	t.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examir	ier.	•					
10)[10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to th	e drawing(s) be held in al	beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	•		• •				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the atta	ached Office Action or form P	TO-152.				
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S	S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a)[a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documer							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri		· · ·	l Stage				
	application from the International Bure			, olugo				
* S	ee the attached detailed Office action for a lis							
Attachment	(s)							
1) 🔯 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		view Summary (PTO-413)					
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Pape	r No(s)/Mail Date e of Informal Patent Application (PT	O 152)				
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 · No(s)/Mail Date		r:	U-102)				

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on December 2, 2004 has been entered. Examiner acknowledges that claims 3, 10, 20 and 21 have been amended, claims 1-2 have been canceled and claims 41-51 have been added. Subsequently, claims 3-13, 20-26 and 41-51 under consideration, while claims 14-19 and 27-32 have been withdrawn from further consideration.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see pages 9-10, filed December 2, 2004, with respect to the rejection of **claims 3-13** and **21-26** under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, new grounds of rejection are made hereinafter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 4. Claims 43 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, claim 43 recites a "reinforcing member" that "is embedded in the wall which forms the expandable housing" and claim

51 recites a "reinforcing member" that "helps to bias the expandable housing in the contracted position." Both of these claim limitations were not present in the original disclosure and therefore, are considered new matter, which cannot be entered in an amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 7. Claims 3-13, 20-26 and 41-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hopkins et al. (US 6,544,279) in view of Amplatz (US 6,123,715).

Regarding **claims 3** and **41**, Hopkins et al. discloses a restraining device for maintaining a self-expanding medical device on a delivery device, including an expandable housing portion (594) that is made primarily from an elastic material, which

is stretchable between the contracted position and expanded position. However, Hopkins et al. do not explicitly recite at least one reinforcing member associated therewith for providing additional column strength to the housing portion. On the other hand, it would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to incorporate reinforcing members. For example, Amplatz teaches the use of reinforcing members for providing additional strength to a guiding catheter (column 3, lines 40-49). Thus, it would be within the scope of the invention and obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to incorporate reinforcement members in the expandable housing of Hopkins et al. for the purpose of controlling the expansion/rigidity. It is known to combine different materials to achieve different strengths and expansion ability.

Regarding **claims 4** and **42**, Hopkins et al. as modified discloses that as applied to **claims 3** and **41**, as well as a plurality of reinforcing members associated with the expandable housing portion to provide additional column strength to the housing portion is within the scope of this modification and would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding **claim 5**, Hopkins et al. as modified discloses that as applied to **claim 4**, as well as reinforcing members that extend substantially along the length of the expandable housing portion but do not interfere with the expansion of the elastic material is within the scope of this modification and would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art.

Art Unit: 3743

Regarding claims 6 and 44, Hopkins et al. as modified discloses that as applied to claims 5 and 41 as well as reinforcing members (braids) that are elongated bar-like members made from a material having high stiffness (column 4, lines 11-24).

Regarding claims 7 and 45, Hopkins et al. as modified discloses that as applied to claims 3 and 41 as well as an elastic material that is selected from a group of materials, which includes silicone, polyurethane, polyisoprene and lower durometer PEBAX.

Regarding claims 8 and 46, Hopkins et al. as modified discloses that as applied to claims 4 and 41 as well as Amplatz further teaches a reinforcing member that is made from a material selected from a group including stainless steel, polymeric material, and Nitinol.

Regarding claims 9 and 47. Hopkins et al. as modified discloses that as applied to claims 8 and 41 as well as radiopacity material (598). It would be further within the scope of the modification to have the reinforcing members loaded with a material having high radiopacity.

Regarding claims 10 and 48, Hopkins et al. as modified discloses that as applied to claims 3 and 41 as well as an expandable housing portion that is made from a substantially tubular-shaped material that is highly elastic. However, Hopkins et al. do not explicitly recite a plurality of reinforcing members disposed within the tubular elastic material to provide additional column strength to the housing portion. On the other hand, it would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to incorporate reinforcing members. For example, Amplatz teaches the use of reinforcing members for providing

additional strength to a guiding catheter (column 3, lines 40-49). Thus, it would be within the scope of the invention and obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to incorporate reinforcement members in the expandable housing of Hopkins et al. for the purpose of controlling the expansion/rigidity. It is known to combine different materials to achieve different strengths and expansion ability.

Regarding claims 11-13, 43 and 48-50, Hopkins et al. as modified discloses that as applied to claims 4 and 41. However, the following claims disclose location options for the reinforcing members. Since no particular location has been deemed critical, they can be considered equivalents. Thus, it would be within the scope of the modification to have the reinforcing members disposed within the elastic material forming the expandable housing portion, attached to the surface of the expandable housing portion, and/or disposed along the expandable housing portion.

Regarding **claim 20**, Hopkins et al. as modified discloses that as applied to **claim 3**, as well as an expandable housing portion (594) that includes a low expansion section with at least one expansion member (such as 590) disposed within the low expansion section to provide the elasticity needed to move the housing portion between the contracted position and expanded position. "Low expansion section" is considered a relative phrase and a basis for comparison has not been provided.

Regarding **claim 21**, Hopkins et al. as modified discloses that as applied to **claim**3. However, Hopkins et al. do not explicitly recite a plurality of low expansion sections and a plurality of expansion members disposed between low expansion sections. On the other hand, it would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to incorporate

reinforcing members. For example, Amplatz teaches the use of reinforcing members for providing additional strength to a guiding catheter (column 3, lines 40-49). Thus, it would be within the scope of the invention and obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to incorporate reinforcement members in the expandable housing of Hopkins et al. for the purpose of controlling the expansion/rigidity. It is known to combine different materials to achieve different strengths and expansion ability. Further, to have the expansion members disposed between the low expansion sections would further be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art.

Page 7

Regarding claim 22, Hopkins et al. as modified discloses that as applied to claim 21 as well as radiopacity material (598). It would be further within the scope of the modification to have the reinforcing members loaded with a material having high radiopacity.

Regarding claim 23, Hopkins et al. as modified discloses that as applied to claim 21 as well as an elastic material that is selected from a group of materials, which includes silicone, polyurethane, polyisoprene and lower durometer PEBAX.

Regarding claim 24, Hopkins et al. as modified discloses that as applied to claim 23 as well as low expansion sections that are made from a material selected from a group including cross-linked HDPE, polyolefin and polyamide.

Regarding claim 25, Hopkins et al. as modified discloses that as applied to claim 21. Further, this modification would yield expansion members that extend longitudinally along the length of the expandable housing portion.

Regarding claim 26, Hopkins et al. as modified discloses that as applied to claim 25. Further, this modification would yield expansion members that include means for preventing the low expansion sections from tearing as the expandable housing portion expands from the contracted position to the expanded position.

Regarding claim 51, Hopkins et al. as modified discloses that as applied to claim 41 as well as teaching reinforcing members that are fully capable of helping to bias the expandable housing portion in the contracted position.

Conclusion

- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the 8. examiner should be directed to Andrea M. Ragonese whose telephone number is **571-272-4804.** The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 am until 5:00 pm.
- 9. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry A. Bennett can be reached on 571-272-4791. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.
- 10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AMR

February 22, 2005

Supervisory Patent Examiner